

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/608,818

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Elena Tsoy

Art Unit

1762

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Lee J. Fleckenstein.(3) Elena Tsoy.(2) Shrive Beck.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 October 2002 .

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: _____ .

Identification of prior art discussed: Hartley et al .

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

ETsoy
Examiner's signature, if required

Applicants state that fluoroelastomers (such as Viton B) of Hartley et al comprising terpolymers having monomer units in claimed range do not read on claimed thermoplastic fluorocarbon terpolymer since fluoroelastomers (including Viton B) and thermoplastic fluorocarbon terpolymers are distinctly different polymers. The Examiner disagrees with this statement. According to published manufacturer's material (this material was faxed to Applicants before the current interview) Viton B can be thermoformed to produce various articles such as hoses; and since a term "thermoforming" is defined by Hawley's Dictionary as forming or shaping a thermoplastic sheet under heat and pressure, thermoformable Viton B fluoroelastomer is supposed to have thermoplastic properties. Moreover, numerous US Patents, some of which were discussed with Applicants during the previous interview, show that thermoplastic fluoroelastomers comprising terpolymers of claimed monomer units are well known in the art. For these reasons, contrary to Applicants' statement, the Examiner believes that fluoroelastomers of Hartley et al cover claimed thermoplastic fluorocarbon terpolymers. However, if Applicants present Affidavit showing evidence that fluoroelastomers and thermoplastic fluorocarbon terpolymers are mutually exclusive species, the application would be allowed, in the absence of other evidence to the contrary, based on the presented evidence.